

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 29, 2005, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 22-42 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 14, 19, 32, 37 and 38 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims. In this Amendment, claims 40-42 have been added. A version of the claims containing markings to show the changes made is included hereinabove. Applicants believe that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 19, 20, 22-31 and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,448 to Hemphill et al. (hereinafter Hemphill) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,594,786 to Connelly et al. (hereinafter Connelly). Hemphill discloses a management event notification system using event notification messages written using a markup language. Connelly discloses a fault tolerant high availability meter.

The Examiner stated that Hemphill is silent regarding an event message containing product versions currently supported and a definition of a set of classes for the product among other elements of claim 1. Accordingly, the Examiner cited Connelly as teaching product versions currently supported and a definition of a set of classes. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Regarding product versions currently supported the Examiner cited column 8, lines 53-64. A careful review of Connelly reveals that an event includes configuration data, and that the configuration data includes an OS revision. Thus, Connelly discloses a single version only, not product versions currently supported as disclosed in claim 1. The system of claim 1 can support multiple versions, and thus provide additional benefits as opposed to Connelly which is limited to a single version, and therefore provides less functionality than the present invention. Further, claim 1 recites the registration information includes a definition of a set of classes. The Examiner stated that Connelly teaches the same at column 19, lines 27-31. A careful review of Connelly at this location reveals a report which is summarized for all entity classes. Thus Connelly is preparing a report summarized for all entity classes. In contrast to Connelly, claim 1

recites that the event message includes a definition of a set of classes, not a report summarized for all entity classes. Connelly fails to disclose or suggest an event message containing event registration information which includes a definition of a set of classes. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, claim 1 is believed allowable over Hemphill and Connelly. Claims, 19, 37 and 38 include similar language as claim 1 and are believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-13, 20, 22-31 and 39 depend from claims 1 or 19 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-13, 19, 20, 22-31 and 37-39 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Hemphill in view of Connelly is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 14-16, 18, 32-34 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,779,004 to Zintel (hereinafter Zintel) in view of Connelly. Zintel discloses auto-configuring of peripheral on host/peripheral computing platform with peer networking-to-host/peripheral adapter for peer networking connectivity. The Examiner cited Connelly as teaching product versions currently supported and a definition of a set of classes. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's statement. Regarding product versions currently supported the Examiner cited column 8, lines 53-64. A careful review of Connelly reveals that an event includes configuration data, and that the configuration data includes an OS revision. Thus, Connelly discloses a single version only, not product versions currently supported as disclosed in claim 14. The system of claim 14 can support multiple versions, and thus provide additional benefits as opposed to Connelly which is limited to a single version, and therefore provides less functionality than the present invention. Further, claim 14 recites the registration information includes a definition of a set of classes. The Examiner stated that Connelly teaches the same at column 19, lines 27-31. A careful review of Connelly at this location reveals a report which is summarized for all entity classes. Thus Connelly is preparing a report summarized for all entity classes. In contrast to Connelly, claim 14 recites that the event message includes a definition of a set of classes, not a report summarized for all entity classes. Connelly fails to disclose or suggest an event message containing event registration information which includes a definition of a set of

-14-

classes. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, claim 14 is believed allowable over Hemphill and Connelly. Claim 32 includes similar language as claim 14 and is believed allowable for the same reasons as claim 14. Claims 15-16, 18, 33-34 and 36 depend from claims 14 or 32 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 14-16, 18, 32-34 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Zintel in view of Connelly is believed to have been overcome.

Claims 40-42 have been added. Claims 40-42 depend from claims 1, 14 or 19 and are believed allowable as they depend from a base claim which is believed allowable. Additionally, claims 40-42 further define the definition of the set of classes in the event message as including, for each class, a name, a unique identifier, a description of the class, and definitions of dynamic variables for each class, the dynamic variables including properties and alarm attributes.

In view of the above, the Examiner's rejections are believed to have been overcome placing claims 1-2, 4-20 and 22-42 in condition for allowance and reconsideration and allowance thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

-15-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

David W. Rouille
David W. Rouille, Esq.
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 40,150
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-06(4183)

Dated: March 29, 2006